

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 16, 17 and 20 were objected to because of informalities. Claims 16, 17 and 20 have been amended to correct the informalities.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-14 and 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,136,376 to Yagasaki (hereinafter Yagasaki). Claim 12 has been amended to clarify what applicant regards as the invention, and the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Yagasaki does not disclose or teach a controller for controlling the operation of the video compression unit and the video transmission unit as claimed in claims 1 and 12. The Examiner cites Yagasaki as having the above-mentioned feature.

The Examiner states that Fig 6, element 31, shows a controller for controlling the operation of the video compression unit and the video transmission unit (Office action, page 3). However, Yagasaki discloses a data control circuit 31 for controlling operation of a video signal coding circuit unit 2 only. The data control circuit 31 receives a feedback from the transmission buffer memory 3, but does not provide a control signal to the transmission buffer memory 3 as shown in Fig. 6. Thus, it is clear that the data control circuit 31 does not control the operation of a video transmission unit as claimed. Therefore, since every limitation of the claim is not taught by the reference as required, claims 1-3, 5-7, 12-14 and 16-18 are patentable over Yagasaki.

Claim 4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Yagasaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,638,129 to Lee (hereinafter Lee), and Claim 9-10 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yagasaki in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,537,409 to Moriyama (hereinafter Moriyama). For the reasons explained above, Yagasaki does not teach or suggest every limitation of the claims. Further, neither Lee nor Moriyama fail to disclose the controller for controlling the operation of the video compression unit and the video transmission unit. Therefore, since every limitation of the claim is not taught or suggested by the references as required, claims 4, 9-10, 15 and 20-21 are patentable over Yagasaki in view of Lee and Moriyama.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 33826.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:



Michael W. Garvey, Reg. No. 35878

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 19, 2004